



The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning™

2022

Volume 12/Issue 2

Article 8

Learning or cheating?: Proofreading for the work of writing instruction during tutorials

Juhi Kim, juhikim.1@gmail.com

Recommended Citations:

APA

Kim, J. (2022). Learning or cheating?: Proofreading for the work of writing instruction during tutorials. *The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning*, 12(2), 138-155.

MLA

Juhi Kim. "Learning or cheating?: Proofreading for the work of writing instruction during tutorials" *The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning* 12.2 (2022): 138-155

The JLTL is freely available online at www.jltl.org, with neither subscription nor membership required.

Contributors are invited to review the Submission page and manuscript templates at www.jltl.org/Submitonline

As an online journal, the JLTL adopts a green-policy journal. Please print out and copy responsibly.





The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning, 2022(2), pp. 138-155

Learning or cheating?: Proofreading for the work of writing instruction during tutorials

Juhi Kim¹

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 26 April, 2022
Revisions completed 25 May, 2022
Published 30 June, 2022

Key Words:

Proofreading,
L2 Writers,
Writing Tutorial,
Engagement,
Writing Center

ABSTRACT

As the focus of the writing instruction in the writing center moved from product to process, the practice of the writing instruction has changed from the traditional error-correction to the collaborative social process. No proofreading is the major policy of the writing instruction in the university writing center. However, oftentimes, the tutees who bring the concerns of mechanical issues in their writings to the writing center are confused about the no proofreading policy as a rejection to the assistance they look for. In this regard, this study examines how the no proofreading policy is enacted during tutorials, i.e., how the proofreading practices are enacted during the actual tutorials in the writing center. How do the proofreading practices look when they do not violate the center's policy? How do they look when they do violate the center's policy? In order for the proofreading practice to be an acceptable to the center's policy, the tutee's interactive engagement is required for the work of problem solving in their talk in interactions during tutorials. By examining the structural details of the talk and interactions for the work of proofreading practices during tutorials, this study aims to understand the pedagogy of writing instruction that the contemporary writing center pursues.

© Association of Applied Linguistics. All rights reserved

"What do you do if you don't proofread in the writing center?" This is the question asked by the first time visiting, second language (L2) tutee. The tutee came to the writing center with concerns of grammar of his writing and was informed of the no proofreading policy. Lizzy, the experienced tutor, explained that they can talk about grammar during tutorial, but they don't proofread. But the tutee asked, "What do you do (here) if you don't proofread? Then he left. Having been perplexed with the situation, Lizzy brought up the question in the staff meeting and asked for advice. Various opinions about proofreading during tutorials were discussed and debated vigorously. Some tutors said that they don't proofread but work on grammar during tutorials, some said that grammar is not the most critical issue to work on during tutorials as an error-free paper does not necessarily mean a good paper, and some said, proofreading and teaching grammar cannot be clearly distinguished from each other; there is no clear-cut answer in between the work of proofreading and teaching grammar. In the midst of the discussion of legitimacy of the proofreading practice during tutorials, Shawna, one of the experienced tutors, shouted, "Well, actually, I do proofreading all the time during tutorials. If I answer the phone at the writing center, I would say,

¹Juhi Kim received her Ph.D. in Foreign, Second, and Multilingual Language Education from The Ohio State University and taught in Miami University in Ohio, USA. juhikim.1@gmail.com

Hello. This is Ms. Jones in the writing center and I'm proofreading! Because that's what I do here every day." Everybody burst out laughing.

As the tutors shared what they do with proofreading during tutorials and laughed all together about Shawna's confession about proofreading for her everyday work in the writing center, they admit that they do proofreading for the routine work of writing for the tutorials in the writing center. However, at the same time, there was also the tutors' reluctance of fixing only by proofreading for the work of instruction, as it would not be beneficial for the tutees' long-term development for writing ability. What the tutors talked about proofreading for the writing tutorials is not much different from what McNally and Kooyman (2017) found in their study about the proofreading support that the Academic Language Learning (ALL) staff and advisors provide and what they perceive in Australian university. Particularly, the ethical dilemmas that the proofreaders experience when they work on students' writings were investigated quite thoroughly by Harwood (2019) and Harwood, Austin, Macaulay (2009, 2010, 2012). Despite the no proofreading policy and the ethical dilemmas for the work of proofreading, proofreading is still one of the most frequent requests that the tutors receive during tutorials, particularly from the first time visiting tutees (Kim, 2018b) and one of the major instructional works provided in the writing center (McNally & Kooyman, 2017). In this regard, the question of, "what do you do if you don't proofread?" is a request to articulate the pedagogy of writing instruction that the writing center pursues, i.e., it is the question of how the writing center teaches writing.

Therefore, this study will examine how the proofreading practices are enacted during the actual tutorials in the writing center as a work of writing instruction. How do they look when they occur as ordinary acceptable works of writing instruction that do not violate the center's policy? How do they look when they violate the center's policy as unacceptable works of writing instruction? By looking into the details of the talk and interactions for the acceptable and unacceptable work of proofreading practices during tutorials, this study aims to understand the pedagogy of writing instruction that the contemporary writing center pursues.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Instructional Philosophy of the Writing Center

Writing instruction in the writing centers has evolved in its definition, pedagogy, and philosophical approach. The focus of writing instruction in the writing center has shifted from a remediation service to a socially collaborative process (Lunsford, 1991; North, 1984). The change of the focus in the pedagogy of writing from the text to the writer is represented in North's (1984) claim, "the writing center is to produce better writers, not better writing (p. 438)." He described the relationship between the tutors and the writing process as a participant-observer methodology and defined a tutor as a participant observer who supports the tutee's writing process to help the writer express their ideas. He contrasted the old center instruction and the new center instruction in terms of the role of the tutors during tutorial. In the new center instruction, tutors take part in the ritual of the writing process by observing, interfering, and participating in ways that allow the writers to talk about their writing. In this sense, tutors exist not to fix the textual problems apart or after writing, but to talk about writing with the writers for changes in the writer. His idea is well known in the *No proofreading* policy nowadays as one of the major instructional policies in the writing center. Lunsford (1991) emphasized the concept of collaboration in writing instruction as well. She claimed that writing instruction cannot be separated from reading, thinking, and talking during tutorials. The various stages of the process of writing should be integrated and collaborated on, not only to solve problems but also to find problems as well. The knowledge is not simply conveyed as an isolated entity; it is reconstructed through negotiation

collaboratively via conversation between the tutor and the tutee (Lunsford, 1991). Brooks (1991) also claimed that the tutor's job is to improve the writer, not the writer's text and that the goal of the tutorial session is not the paper, but the student. He discussed the philosophy of minimalist tutoring, which makes the students do all the work for their writing and supported a hands-off approach to students' papers, avoiding the error correction, but instead working with the higher order concerns. While North's maxim of the non-directive, student-centered approach presides profoundly as a representative principle in the writing center philosophy, alternative voices were raised as the non-directive approach can become dogmatic; writing center practice should include both directive and non-directive approaches in a more flexible manner to support the diverse students and the need of the disciplines (Ashton-Jones, 1988; Shamoon & Burns, 1995). The debate between directive vs. non-directive, product vs. process approach was claimed as a continuum of practices rather than dichotomy (Carino, 2003; Corbett, 2013; Clark, 1988, 2001; Geller et al, 2007). Corbett (2011) claimed that the "tutors can better serve (and be better served) if they are encouraged to broaden their instructional repertoires" (p.149-150) and have more "instructional flexibility" (p.150) rather than taking strictly either a directive or non-directive approach.

2.2. L2 Writers in the Writing Center and No Proofreading Policy

Writing centers have been established and developed to provide help to the native speakers of English in its inception of the institutional history in the US (Carino, 2001). However, the increased population of multilingual writers in the universities nowadays has become the major clientele of the university writing center. Roughly, more than half of clientele in the university writing center is international students who are from different backgrounds in their language, culture and educational history. Academic writing for many L2 writers is challenging work as it includes rhetorical and cultural differences in organizing text and arguments (Connor, 1997; Kim, 2014; Leki, 1993). Hyland (2003) and Hinkel (2004) discussed that academic writing in a second language is cognitively more challenging for L2 writers as it requires more sufficient syntactic and lexical knowledge and their language and rhetorical skills are still in transition in development so they may not fully transfer to the target language. The university writing center on campus in this light is very attractive to the international students as a place to practice and improve their English writing ability. Despite the attractiveness of the writing center for its convenience in many aspects, however, many L2 writers experience difficulties in working with the tutors in the conversation-based tutorials in the writing center. For those who learned English as an academic subject in an EFL (English as a foreign language) context, communicating in English for everyday purposes is challenging enough to adapt to the new environment. Also, as they studied English mostly to prepare for the standardized English test, many of them never have experienced English writing class that requires multiple stages of writing process in their previous learning history (Dvorak, 2016; Linville, 2009, Reid, 1998). With the same reason, they are familiar with the traditional teacher-centered instructional style, which is "a teacher teaches and a student listens" and struggle with engaging in the conversation based, one-to-one writing conference. (Ferris, 2003, 2009) In this light, talking about their writings with the L1 tutor in the face-to-face tutorial setting is not just challenging work for them, but creates confusion about what to do during the tutorials and what to expect for learning from the tutorials. The confusion can easily become frustration when they see that there is no visible improvement in the text of their writings after the tutorial. In the worst case, it becomes pointless for them to ask any further help for their writings from the writing center (Kim, 2014, 2018a).

The confusion that L2 writers experience in the writing tutorials is not just about the language difficulty, but also about the different instructional styles. The conversation-based, process-focused instruction that the writing center pursues can cause misunderstanding in the L2 writers who have no knowledge or any previous experience of this instructional style in terms of the goal and the expected

outcome of the writing instruction. When the first-time visiting tutee visits the center to clean up errors from their paper but fails to receive what they asked, the simple misunderstanding of the work of the writing center can become a disappointment and can sometimes develop even further into tension during tutorials between the tutor and the tutee. The tutors who understand this quick-fix desire for proofreading that some tutees bring to the center confront them and steer them to follow the center's no proofreading policy (Kim, 2018b). For the tutor, proofreading just to clean up the paper is cheating and harmful for the long-term development for writing ability. For the tutees who struggle in working with the tutor for an unknown learning outcome during the tutorial, the grammar errors that still remain in their papers after the work of tutorial are frustrating. For them, in those cases, visiting the center to work on their writings has no benefit, as the errors still remain in their writings (Kim, 2014, 2018a). Writing centers provide a list of proofreaders for those who want only fix-it services for their writings and explain the rationale of the no proofreading policy. Many tutors recognize the needs and the benefits for the sentence-level proofreading practice for the novice writers as well (Chromik, 2002; Corbett, 2013; Hawthorne, 1999; Nordlof, 2014). However, the tension between the tutor and the tutee over proofreading and the dilemmas that the tutors experience, especially with the first time visiting tutees and L2 writers are still ongoing issues for the work of the writing center (Harwood, 2018; Harwood, et al., 2010, 2012; Kim, 2018a, 2018b).

Therefore, this study will investigate how the proofreading practices are enacted during the actual tutorials; how the instructional sequence looks when the proofreading practice becomes learning that does not violate the center's no proofreading policy; and how the instructional sequence looks when the proofreading practice becomes cheating that violates the center's pedagogy of writing instruction. By capturing the turn-by-turn, instructional sequences between the tutor and the tutee and providing the analysis of their talk and interactions for the work of writing tutorials, this study will deepen the understanding of the pedagogical philosophy of the writing center in the US.

3. Method

3.1. *Participants and Context*

This study was conducted as an ethnographically approached qualitative study to explore the work of writing tutorials in the university writing center, located in one of the major Midwestern universities in the US. All of the 25 tutors in this writing center, both graduate and undergraduate students were native English speaking students. Among them, the tutorials from 11 tutors (3 undergraduate and 8 graduate students) who had been tutoring in the center for two to three years were videotaped. The tutees in this study are international graduate and undergraduate students who speak English as a second or a foreign language. Most of them are from East Asia: China, Hong Kong, South Korea, Japan, Taiwan, and Vietnam.

3.2. *Data Collection*

Along with the transcript analysis of videoed tutorials, field notes from the participant observation of the staff meetings in the writing center were collected for ethnographic description. With the consent of the tutors and the tutees under IRB approval, 36 tutorials (1,290 minutes) were videotaped over six months. Among them, the sequences that show the distinctive pattern of collaborative work of the proofreading practices for writing were selected for analysis. The selected sequences were logged and transcribed thoroughly turn-by-turn in their talk and interactions.

3.3. Analytical Framework

For an analytical framework, conversation analysis (CA) was employed to examine the participants' talk and interaction during tutorials and to identify the nature of learning through the turn-by-turn, fine-grained transcripts of the instructional work. CA reveals the members' social actions that are accomplished through talk-in-interactions and the mutual understanding in their management of the interactional practice (Markee, 2000, 2009). Ethnographic description, combined with CA, provides the deeper understanding of the complex nature of human interaction and provides the details of the settings and identities of the participants in terms of how it was intended and reported (Maynard, 2003; Pomerantz, 2005; Silverman, 1999; Waring et al, 2012). The excerpts selected here were transcribed following the convention of transcript notation (Sacks et al, 1974). Specific attention was given to the description of the participants' talk-in-interactions that display the details of the work of the writing tutorial and the interactional competence of the participants, which is locally managed and accomplished in its interactional context of the work of the writing tutorials.

4. Analysis

The analysis for the selected excerpts will be provided with two types of proofreading practices occurring during tutorials: proofreading as a routine automated process during tutorials and proofreading as a main work of writing instruction. As the tutor and the tutee begin working with the text for the tutorial, proofreading occurs almost simultaneously along with reading the text by the tutor and it also is offered sometimes like a reward at the end of the tutorial to wrap up the work of the tutorial. This is the proofreading practice occurring routinely during the tutorials. The other proofreading practice occurs as a main work of writing instruction. Different from the routine automated proofreading practice, the proofreading practice occurring as a main work of instruction during tutorials requires more of the tutee's interactional competence in its engagement to the interactional organization of the work of the tutorial.

4.1. Proofreading as a Routine Automated Work

Once the tutor and the tutee agree with what to work with for the writing tutorial, they begin working with the text by reading it. As the tutor begins reading the text either silently or loudly, proofreading occurs automatically. It occurs like an auto-correction function in the computer. The tutor reads the text while correcting the mistakes simultaneously. This correction is not necessarily to clean up the grammar errors from the paper but for the tutor to make sense of the tutee's text. Proofreading in this stage is a way to understand the tutee's text for the tutor in order to work with the text for the tutorial. This excerpt is from the tutorial of the undergraduate student from South Korea. (T: Tutor, C: Client, Tutee)

Excerpt 1. Proofreading along with reading

- 74 T: so (.) (h) we will- we will(.) take a look for it u:m. alright(.) so-
 75 (4.0) (h) ((T, reading the paper in silence))
 76 (5.0) (hh) ((T, reading the paper in silence))
 77 ► you don't need the article here
 78 ► 'cause you are not talking about an individual offense
 79 ► you are talking about it as a (h) concept

In line 74, the tutor moves on to read the text. He reads the text in silence and stops for proofreading in lines 77-79 about the misused article. He quickly points out the problem and how to correct it, and then continues reading. This is a brief form of proofreading. Proofreading along with reading usually occurs automatically while reading the text. The tutor directly points out the problem and corrects it with a quick explanation. Then he continues reading it until he finds the next problem to work with.

Next is an excerpt from a tutorial of the undergraduate student from China. The tutor is reading the paper silently. As soon as the tutor finds a grammar mistake, he gives a quick correction and continues reading.

Excerpt 2. Proofreading along with reading

172 T: ((T, reading the paper in silence))
 173 it is a fact (.) it is- they jus- idiomatically (.)
 174 ► we wouldn't say it is the fact
 175 ► um(.) we could say it is the case
 176 C: hm hm
 177 ► T: but (.) it is a fact

While reading the text, the tutor points out the misused article with a quick correction and continues reading the next paragraph. Proofreading along with reading occurs with a direct correction of the problem with an explanation. This type of proofreading occurs almost automatically as the tutor reads the paper.

The next excerpt is from a tutorial of a graduate student from South Korea. The tutor and the tutee just have finished the talk about structure and organization of the paper. Time is up. Before finishing the tutorial, the tutor gives him a quick brush-up on the grammar mistakes.

Excerpt 3. Proofreading to wrap up the work

404 T: beyond that, there were about eight (.) uh surface level things(.)
 405 C: hm hm
 406 ► T: u:m *their book* eithe:r uh
 407 C: =[*their (.)] ((C, pointing at the line of the paper))
 408 T: [*the book*]
 409 C: =yeah
 410 T: =right

Just having finished a major discussion of the structural issues of the paper, the tutor points out the several grammar mistakes that he marked on the paper. The tutor reads the phrase, "*their book*" in line 406 and the tutee follows the line that the tutor points at by repeating the word, "*their*" in a soft voice. Simultaneously with the tutee's repeating the word, the tutor gives a word to replace it, "*the book*" (line 408). The tutee agrees with the tutor by latch and the tutor confirms the agreement (lines 409-410). Proofreading was given quickly by brushing up the minor mistakes. In this way, proofreading occurring at the end of the tutorial is usually offered to wrap up the work of the tutorial like a reward for a final check-up.

As shown, proofreading occurs routinely during the tutorial along with reading or to wrap up the work of the tutorial. It occurs naturally as part of the work of the tutorial and becomes a part of instruction that occurs routinely in a way to move to the next course of action for the tutorial. In the next section, we will examine the sequences that proofreading works as a main work of the tutorial.

4.2. Proofreading as the Main Work of Writing Instruction

Once the tutor and the tutee begin working with the paper for the work of the tutorial, the tutor or the tutee finds a problem to work with and makes it identifiable for the work of the tutorial. When they find a problem to work with, either the tutor or the tutee asks a question to make the problem identifiable, or more indirectly, the tutor simply indicates that there is a problem in the sentence. Once the problem to work with is identified, both the tutor and the tutee engage with each other to solve the problem interactively and collaboratively. When their talk and interactions to solve the problem were engaged collaboratively with their participations, particularly with the tutee's participation for the interactive engagement, the proofreading practice becomes learning. When there is no interactive engagement with the tutee's participation for the problem solving, the instruction for proofreading practice becomes cheating. Thus, how the tutee engages with the work of solving the problem identified for the tutorial is the key to make the proofreading practice for learning or cheating.

4.2.1. When The Proofreading Practice Becomes Learning

In this section, I will introduce excerpts that show the proofreading practice occurring for the main work of writing instruction during tutorials. The first excerpt is from the tutorial of an undergraduate student from China. The tutor finds a problem to work with and makes it identifiable. The tutee makes a suggestion for the problem pointed out. When the tutee makes suggestions for the problem identified, the proofreading practice becomes learning that does not violate the center's no proofreading policy.

Excerpt 4. The tutor identifies a problem -> The tutee makes a suggestion for the problem

- 351 T: *approximately forty seven percent*.(.)(T, reading the text)
 352 ► and then(.) here you're missing a preposition
 353 C: (5.0) ((looking at the sentences))
 354 T: so one of those () words(.)
 355 ► C: =of?
 356 ► T: =yes (.) exactly(.) so you know(.) you know this

The tutor reads the phrase (the italicized font), "approximately forty seven percent" from the tutee's paper then she announces the problem, "you're missing a preposition" (line 352). Instead of fixing the problem, the tutor invites the tutee's attention to the problem by simply mentioning the problem. The tutee doesn't reply immediately instead, he takes a pause for five seconds. The tutor tries to elaborate a bit of the problem (line 354) then the tutee answers, "of?" by latch with a rising tone in line 355. The tutor's agreement follows immediately by latch for confirmation (line 356). This is a quick form of the proofreading practice enacted as a main work of writing instruction. The tutor points out the problem, the tutee suggests the solution for the problem, and the tutor confirms the tutee's suggestion with agreement.

The next excerpt is from a tutorial that the tutee identifies a problem and makes a suggestion as well for the problem she identified. This is from a tutorial of an undergraduate student from South Korea.

Excerpt 5. The tutee identifies a problem -> The tutee makes a suggestion for the problem

- 161 ► C: uh uh and (.) this word can be (1.0) *like* (1.3)
 162 ► *according to this- the department storis(.) so:ld(.) dollars?*
 163 ► Is it right?

- 164 T: (h) U::m (0.7) Yeah I am not- do not think so (.)
 165 because you do not really sell dollars
 166 ► C: hm hm *then //ea:rned?*
 167 T: //(or)
 168 C: *Okay*
 169 T: u::m let's see (0.4) *the department store initiate-* ((T, reading the text))
 170 yea- it- you're saying(.) you're saying that they
 171 =got (.2) //those million dollars (.)
 172 C: //h::m
 173 T: so ea:rned or ga:ined will be //perfect
 174 C: //h::m ((C, taking notes))
 175 T: (1.6) hm hm
 176 C: *oka(h)y*

The tutee reads the sentence (the italicized font in line 162) from her paper with the elongation of the word, “sold” in a rising tone then asks a question if it sounds right. The tutee makes the problem identifiable by elongating the sound of the problematic word, “sold”, which she is not sure of its use, and asks a direct yes/no question to the tutor, “Is it right?” in line 163. The tutor gives a direct answer as well to the tutee, “I do not think so” with a short reason why (line 164-5). The tutee now gives her second try in a softer tone for the word to replace, “then ea:rned?” (line 166). She is fishing for the right answer, expecting to receive a correct word to replace the problematic word in her sentence. By giving a try for a proper, replaceable word, the tutee is actively engaging in the work of problem solving for her sentence. The tutor overlaps the tutee in line 167, “(or)”. The tutee marks a receipt and waits for the tutor to continue (line 168). The tutor reads the sentence aloud (line 169) and rephrases the sentence, “you’re saying that they=got (.) those million dollars” (lines 170-171). As soon as the tutor replaced the word, “sold” with “got” in line 171, the tutee immediately noticed the word being replaced with “got”, which will be the word that she can use for her sentence. She overlaps the tutor in line 172 with agreement, “h:m”. The tutor also accepts the word, “ea:rned”, which the tutee asked for replacement and provided one more word, “gained” for a replacement (line 173). Following the two verbs – “earned” and “gained” - to be replaced, the tutee agrees with the tutor in overlap (line 174). The tutee takes notes on the paper and the tutor gives confirmation (line 175) and the tutee agrees with it (line 176). The problem was solved.

The tutee in this sequence identified the problem and was actively engaged to solve the problems by suggesting words to replace for the problems she asked. The tutor accepted and confirmed the tutee’s suggestion for the problem and provided more words to replace. The tutee led the work for the tutorial with the problem pointing and solving as well. The tutor and the tutee contributed to the work of problem solving turn by turn interactively with each other. The talk in interactions for the problem pointing and the problem solving in this sequence was collaboratively engaged by both the tutee and the tutor in its organization of the structure for the work of the tutorial.

Next is an excerpt that both the tutor and the tutee identify the problems simultaneously and the tutee makes a suggestion to solve the problems. The tutee is an undergraduate student from China.

Excerpt 6. Both the tutor and tutee identify problems simultaneously -> The tutee makes a suggestion for the problem

- 110 T: okay (.) *As we know the ivory carving and manuscript painting*
 111 *are very crucial to: ↓early Christian period* ((T, reading the text))
 112 u:m(.) in this case I would sa:y
 113 ► C: =were?

- 114 T: =very crucial? (.2) well- we::re
 115 y(h)ea(.) ssure (.) past tense(.) that makes sense
 116 C: ((C, correcting his paper)) (4.0)
 117 ► () deleted very?
 118 T: e::eeyea:: I was gonna say (.3)
 119 C: =yea
 120 T: =if something's crucial(.2)
 121 C: =yea
 122 ► T: [do not have needs (.2) that extra emphasis]
 123 ► C: [do not have needs (.3) *the very* yea yea]

The tutor reads the sentence from the paper (the italicized font in lines 110-111) and she is about to comment on a potential problem to work with in line 112. Before the tutor continues identifying the problem, the tutee interrupts the tutor and makes a suggestion, “were?” for the problem he found as well (line 113) from the sentence that the tutor just read. What the tutee asks is if the “are” in line 111 should be “were”. He saw the tense of the verb as a potential problem so the question, “were?” in line 113 functions both for problem identifying and suggesting the answer to solve the problem. However, the tutor was also continuing her turn in line 114 by reading the phrase, “very crucial?” She hasn’t finished the problem pointing in the sentence yet. Her previous turn in line 112 was just interrupted abruptly by the tutee in line 113. With the elongated repetition, “we::re” followed by “well-” in line 114, the tutor confirms what the tutee asks with agreement (line 115). The tutee makes correction on his paper (line 116).

After correcting the sentence, without giving the turn back to the tutor to complete the problem that she was about to identify in line 112, the tutee makes a suggestion, “() deleted very?” in line 117 for the problematic phrase the tutor reads in line 114 “very crucial?” The tutee has seen the problem as well as the tutor so he makes a suggestion if the word, “very” should be deleted. Without having had any chance yet to finish her turn for problem pointing, the tutor so far was asked direct yes/no questions twice in lines 113 and 117. The question in line 113 was a suggestion for the problem that the tutee identified, and the question in line 117 was for the problem that the tutor identified. The tutor accepts quickly the suggestion he asks for the question in line 113. For the question in line 117, the tutor gives a reluctantly elongated agreement, “e::eeyea::” for an answer, then continues the explanation in line 118. The tutee agrees with the tutor, “yea” by latch in line 119, as it was the answer he was waiting for. Without any pause, the tutor continues her explanation in line 120, “If something’s crucial(.2)”. The tutee gives an immediate agreement, “yea” in line 121. Both the tutor and the tutee provide the explanation for the problem they solved for the phrase, “very crucial” simultaneously through two different modes: the tutor in a non-directive mode, “do not have needs (.2) that extra emphasis” (line 122), and the tutee in a directive mode, “do not have needs (.3) *the very* yea yea” (line 123). The tutor explained that there is no need for “that extra emphasis” instead of articulating directly “the very”. The tutee understood it anyhow so he clearly articulated “the very” in a soft tone to reassure with the repeated agreement, “yea yea” in line 123.

The tutor and the tutee in this sequence jointly pointed out the problems. But before the problems are clearly articulated, the tutee made suggestions for the problems. The tutee sees the problem the tutor was identifying and he himself had another problem identified to work with at the same time. The tutee’s suggestions for the problems were accepted by the tutor and confirmed jointly by both the tutor and the tutee simultaneously with the indirect explanation (by the tutor) and the direct correction (by the tutee). The tutor in this sequence follows strictly the non-directive approach in the tutorial. She does not provide any words that may be directly replaced or removed but confirms the tutee’s engagement for problem solving. The tutor guides the tutee to work on his sentence by providing the non-directive oriented

instruction and the tutee catches what the tutor accepts and confirms for the problems that they pointed out jointly. Both the tutor and the tutee follow their own agenda skillfully and interactively to achieve the shared purpose for the work of writing in this tutorial.

4.2.2. When the Proofreading Practice Becomes Cheating

In this section, I will introduce the excerpts that the proofreading practices are enacted as a work of writing instruction. Different from the excerpts 4-6 in the previous section, the excerpts in this section do not show the participated engagement by the tutee to solve the problems identified (either by the tutor or the tutee). When there is no active engagement by the tutee to the work of problem solving, the interactional work of the tutorial that requires the collaborative engagement by both the tutor and the tutee cannot be maintained. When the tutee makes no suggestion for the problem identified, the proofreading practice becomes cheating that violates the center's no proofreading policy.

Next is a case with an undergraduate student from South Korea. The tutor reads aloud the paragraph from the paper and identifies problems to work with. The tutee, however, resists engaging to the work of problem solving.

Excerpt 7. The tutor identifies a problem -> The tutee makes no suggestion for the problem

- 106 T: ((T, reading the paper)) *Many people do know that*
 107 *energy sources are becoming less and less available(.)*
 108 *but are not consciously aware of that when they have*
 109 *constant access to heat gas and electricity*
 110 (3.8)
 111 ► T: what- what do you mean (.3) u:m (.4)
 112 ► this (.) looks kinda like a contradiction(.)
 113 C: =hm hm
 114 T: I know what you mean (.5) but I think
 115 ► you might wanna restate it to make it a little clearer
 116 C: (4.5)
 117 T: you know is it that they do not (.2) um (.3)
 118 always act as responsible as they could? or
 119 (2.8)
 120 ► Iss- it something else maybe?
 121 C: (0.8)
 122 they do not ((C, shaking her head)) really
 123 (4.0)
 124 *(I'm not ssure)* I did not really (.3) c>are
 125 T: (.h) so you may find a way to kind of like (.) communicate that
 126 in a polite way ((light giggle)) (.3) to get there (.)
 127 ► u::m=any ideas?
 128 C: (14.0) ((C, looking at her paper))
 129 *maybe I'll try this one (.2) these da:ys* (2.5)
 130 ((C, pointing at the sentences with pencil))
 131 *()*
 132 (3.0) *(I'm not sure)*
 133 (2.7)
 134 ► T: I think that (.) you'll wanna be really careful from a rhetorical
 135 perspective (.4)

The tutor reads the paragraph aloud (the *Italicized font* in lines 106-109) and pauses for 3.8 seconds in line 110. This signifies that there is a potential problem that the tutor wants to discuss. She points out the problem as “kinda like a contradiction” (lines 111-112). This is an open inquiry for the problem. The tutee marks an immediate receipt in line 113 and the tutor continues the inquiry and makes the second request more direct, “you might wanna restate it to make it a little clearer” (line 115). The tutee takes a 4.5 second pause. This is a long pause in between turns. No response, not even a receipt for the inquiry follows. The tutor now makes her inquiry more direct and specific with the yes/no question in lines 117-118 about the meaning of the sentence. This is the third request for the tutee to engage to the work of problem. The tutor takes a 2.8 second pause without continuing after the unfinished “Or” in line 118. The tutee doesn’t interrupt. The tutor goes ahead and completes her question in line 120. Again, this is an open inquiry that invites the tutee’s engagement for the work of the problem solving.

After a short pause (0.8 second) in line 121, the tutee finally gives her response by repeating what the tutor said in the previous turn, “They do not ((shaking her head)) really”, which seems to be an agreement to the tutor, but in an incomplete form. She then takes another long pause of 4 seconds followed by saying “I’m not ssure” in a soft tone in line 124; then in a normal tone, she says that she “did not really(.3) >are” with an emphasis on “care”. During the tutee’s reply with the long pause (lines 121-124), the tutor doesn’t interrupt but waits for the tutee to finish her answer. The tutee has not replied to the tutor yet. Rather she refuses to answer by saying that she (not, “they”) did not care [about the problem].

The tutor in lines 125-127 reformulates her inquiry with a little bit of enlightening giggling, but this is still the same inquiry that requests the tutee’s engagement to the problem solving. This is the fourth request for tutee’s engagement. The tutee this time takes a 14 second pause in line 128. This is a very long pause in between turns. The tutor is patiently waiting for the tutee to engage to the work of problem solving. She is silently but strongly resisting the tutee’s procrastinating and avoiding engagement to the problemⁱⁱ. After the 14 second pause, the tutee tries to relocate the phrase “these days” in a soft voice that is difficult to recognize (lines 129-131), then she takes another 3 second pause followed by “I’m not sure” in a soft voice (line 132), and then another 2.7 second pause. The tutee didn’t explain the problem that the tutor asked as a contradiction in the sentence. The tutee avoided answering for such a long time and tried to relocate the phrase, but even with that, she dropped her effort by saying that she is not sure. Despite the four requests, the problem raised in line 112 by the tutor was not explained or clarified by the tutee. The tutee’s responses for the problem were that she didn’t really care [about the problem] (line 124), and that she is not sure (line 132). The problem raised for the work of the tutorial was not solved. The tutor does not ask any further request for clarification. The tutor does not provide any solution or suggestions either for the problem. The tutor leaves the problem unsolved and comments for the tutee to “be careful from a rhetorical perspective” (lines 134-135). The problem that the tutor raised in lines 111-112 required clarification by the tutee. Without the tutee’s engagement for the problem raised, there is no way for the tutor to provide any further instruction other than offering the ambiguous guidance of “being careful from a rhetorical perspective (lines 134-135)” she ended up with suggesting. Instead of sharing actively what she meant by the text in her paper, the tutee was just waiting for the tutor to provide a specific word or phrase to replace the problematic sentences during the long, painful pause. The tutor sees it and waits for the tutee to be engaged to the work of problem solving by continuously inviting her, which didn’t work unfortunately.

The next excerpt is a case that the tutee identifies a problem. Without making any suggestions for the problem he identified, he asks an open question about the problematic word he used in his writing. Instead of answering, the tutor asks the same question back to the tutee to explain what he meant. This is an excerpt from a tutorial of an undergraduate student from Taiwan.

Excerpt 8. The tutee identifies a problem -> The tutor redirects the problem back to the tutee

- 193 T: also (.) I think there are (.) a lot of (.) um and this is probably because
194 you did not have (.2) spell check
195 C: hm hm
196 T: and the tools you usually have(.)
197 C: ((nodding))
198 T: you have a lot of (.) typos
199 C: =yea
200 T: things that are(.) just accidents //but
201 ► C: //how bout this? ((C, pointing to a word with a finger))
202 ► T: (.h) that- that is a good example of one um
203 ► so what were you trying to say there?
204 C: like a- I do not know what exactly this is
205 =but it is kind of like a hair style
206 It's very close to your scalp and a ((making hair style with his hands))
207 let me see ((C, opening his book))
208 here it was the close to the scalp
209 T: I- I think if you-(.3) if you say the hair is very close to the scalp
210 that would be more clear than using a word you're not quite sure
211 C: =yea
212 T: what it means (.8) 'cause if you're- it is still hair style
213 C: yea it is hair style =it-it- it's like hairstyle but
214 I googled the image it's kind of old- like a fe(h)(h)male
215 women's hair style ((slight laugh))
216 T: =yeah I- I think using (.) using the words that you know
217 will- will make your paper better

The tutor points out the problems of spelling in the tutee's paper in lines 193-194, 196 and 198. The tutee marks receipts in line 195, 197 with nodding and agreement in line 199. With nodding and agreement, the tutee shows that he recognizes the problems pointed out by the tutor. The tutor continues identifying another problem in line 200 and the tutee interrupts her by pointing to a specific word with his finger. He asks "How about this?" This is a direct and bold move asking for specific correction to the problems that the tutor pointed out indirectly. The tutor marks a receipt but instead of answering, she asks the same question back to the tutee, "So what were you trying to say there?" (line 203).

This is an interesting moment in their talk for interaction for the work of writing. The tutor pointed out overall problems. She didn't make any specific corrections for those problems she identified. She continuously pointed out only the problems. What the tutee wants here is correction for those problems. The tutee makes a move to get the answer by asking directly for one of those problems. Now the tutee is waiting for the tutor to answer to the question. The tutor accepts the tutee's question; however, instead of giving the answer that the tutee is waiting for, she asks the same question back to the tuteeⁱⁱⁱ. By tossing the same question back to the tutee, she gained back the first-turn position (FPP) and waits for the tutee to reply. This is not a simple avoidance of answering. It is a strong invitation for the tutee to engage to the work of the problems pointed in lines 193, 194, 196 and 198. The tutee answers that he doesn't know exactly what it is but tries to explain the word with a "hair style" (line 205) and "very close to the scalp" (lines 206 and 208) by parting his hair with his hands and opens his book to show the image of the hair style (lines 204-208). Explaining the question that he asked to the tutor about the unsure word he used in his paper requires the most effort to find the right expression for the problematic word by gesturing and

showing the image from the book that he initially found. The tutee asked the tutor for the meaning of the word *he* used in his paper, of which he seems to be unsure and the tutor requested that the tutee explain what he meant with the word by asking the same question back to him.

In order to explain the unsure, problematic word he asked about, the tutee displayed clear engagement to solve the problem he identified by questioning. The tutor repeats what the tutee said in his explanation, “very close to the scalp” (lines 206 and 208) and accepts the tutee’s answer by saying, that is “more clear” than using the word that the tutee is not quite sure (line 210). The tutee agrees with the tutor by latch. His answer was confirmed by the tutor with positive feedback of, “more clear”. The tutor continues the feedback but instead of providing any other new replaceable word, she just accepts the word, “hair style” as still good to use (line 212). The problem identified was solved. The tutee agrees with the tutor by repeating what the tutor said, “yea it is hair style” (line 213) and with a slight laugh, he describes the image he googled with the word he was not sure of (lines 214-215). The tutor agrees with the tutee by latch and reconfirms using the word that the tutee knows makes the paper better.

Instead of providing the answer that the tutee asks, asking the same question back to the tutee is to invite the tutee’s engagement for the problem solving activity and make their talk for the work of instruction more interactive. When the tutee’s question for the problem comes to the tutor with no suggestions for a solution, the tutor is placed to give an answer to the tutee. In that case, the tutee has nothing to do to solve the problem identified but waits for the answer as the work to solve the problem was tossed to the tutor. The tutor sees it and tosses the question back to the tutee so that the tutee can work to solve his own problem. As shown, the tutee had to employ all of his ways - words, gesture, and the image from his textbook - to explain what he meant with the problematic word for “hair style”. The tutor’s counter question to the tutee in this excerpt is a way that the tutor makes the talk for instruction more interactive and invites the tutee’s active engagement to the work of problem solving for the tutorial.

5. Findings and Discussion

The proofreading practice during tutorials is enacted naturally as a routine automated process as they begin reading the text to move on to the next course of action for instruction. It is also offered like a reward at the end of the tutorial to wrap up the work of writing. The proofreading practice occurs routinely during tutorials to make the work of writing move smoothly to the next course of action for the work of tutorials before or after the main work of the writing instruction. Other than this routinely occurring automated proofreading practice, the other type of proofreading practice occurs for the main work of writing instruction. For the problems identified to work with during tutorials, the tutor and the tutee negotiate with each other interactively to achieve what they pursue to solve the problem. This proofreading practice occurs routinely as well as the automated proofreading practice discussed earlier; however, the proofreading practice for the main work of writing instruction does not occur in the way in which the tutee receives a free fix-it service for their writings, but the way in which the tutor and the tutee negotiate with each other collaboratively in its interactive organization for the work of the writing. In other words, the tutee’s engagement for the proofreading practice is a requirement, not an option. This is where many L2 writers become confused of the work of the writing tutorials. Regardless of who identifies the problems to work with during tutorials, the tutee should take the fair-share of the work of writing to solve the problems instead of just waiting for the tutor to offer the right words or expressions and correct all the errors in their writings. As was shown in excerpts, when the tutee actively engages with the work of the proofreading practice to solve the problems identified, their talk and interactions for proofreading became more interactive and collaborative, which helped the tutor provide the right help for learning. When there is no participated engagement by the tutee, their interactional work cannot be negotiated or collaborated on with each other. Without the tutee’s contribution to the interactional negotiation to solve

the problems they work with, what the tutor can do to assist the tutee's writing is limited. No collaborative engagement is available in their talk and interactions for the work of the tutorial. Their work for proofreading can be a device for cheating that violates the center's policy.

5.1. Proofreading in the Writing Tutorial: Cheating or Instructing?

The misperception of the work of the writing center as a fix-it-shop (Hairston, 1982; North, 1984; Walvoord, 1981) in the traditional remediation-focused model of the writing center has prevailed still, particularly with L2 tutees who have more concerns about their language-related problems in their second language writing (Brendel, 2012; Nakamaru, 2010; Nan, 2012; Thonus, 2002, 2004; Williams, 2004). They experience more urgent need to improve their writing ability and come to the writing center with the request of proofreading (Kim, 2018a, 2018b). The concerns about grammar, punctuation and clarity in writings are not surprising for any writers; however, what the tutee expects from the tutorial could be very different from what the center offers for instruction. In other words, if the tutee does not know how to work with the tutor in a way to be acceptable to the center's pedagogical policy, despite the desire to be helped to improve their writing ability, they may fail to get help. Given their educational backgrounds, for those L2 students who may be from the traditional teacher-led instructional practices, which view teaching and learning as 'teacher teaches and student listens', the non-directive collaborative conversation based tutorial for writing simply can be confusing and difficult to follow (Kim, 2014). When their goals and expectations for the work of the tutorial do not match in this regard between the tutee who expects only to receive help linearly from the tutor and the tutor who tries to be engaged by the tutee in order to be interactive to offer help to the tutee, they follow their own agenda without having any confluence in between. Their effort for the work of writing goes in vain. If the tutee failed to get what they wanted from the tutorial and does not come back to the center, chances and possibility to improve their writing ability fade away.

In terms of proofreading, the tutors who say that they don't proofread claim proofreading as cheating. The tutors who say that they proofread every day claim that they talk about grammar for instruction, not for cheating. As introduced earlier in the beginning of this paper, there is proofreading that the tutor refused as what they don't provide, and there is proofreading that the tutor jokingly, but confidently, claimed that she does every day during tutorials: the former is the proofreading that can be exploited for cheating and the latter is the proofreading that serves the purpose for instruction. What they are debating is actually *how we teach writing* from two different perspectives: *proofreading* as being prohibited and *talking about grammar* as being allowed by the center. As long as the conversation between the tutor and the tutee continues interactively to solve the problems pointed out, the instruction can continue. But if only the tutor works to solve the problems for the tutee's paper and the tutee sits and waits for the tutor to finish fixing the problems, it becomes cheating. So, the debate about proofreading is not about the practice that should or should not be banned from the center; rather, it is about how we teach grammar and ultimately how we teach writing for long-term development. Proofreading in this light is not the work that is taboo in the center. It is the work that the tutors do every day to improve the tutees' writing ability in a collaboratively negotiated way of conversation that produces better writers, not just better writing.

5.2. L2 tutees' Dilemma, Tutor's Conundrum

The question of *how we teach grammar* is about how we teach writing. When the work of grammar during tutorials via conversation occurs collaboratively negotiated, and engaged by the tutee effectively turn by turn, it becomes the work of instruction that the contemporary writing center pursues.

In other words, in order to work successfully for writing - grammar, punctuation, style, structure, organization, etc. – during tutorials, the tutees have to be able to *talk* effectively with the tutor about their writings. This is where the dilemma of L2 tutees occurs. The majority of L2 clientele who visit the writing center as a novice writer oftentimes are not fully equipped with oral/aural skills that can discuss freely their thoughts about writing (Brendel, 2012; Nakamaru, 2010). So ironically, the problem that they want to solve becomes an obstacle in seeking the help they desire. If they didn't need help with English for their writings, they would never have come to the writing center initially. L2 tutees, particularly the first time visiting novice tutees, encounter this paradoxical situation when seeking the help they desire the most; they realize that they lack the skills that are essential to ask for the help they need (Kim, 2018c).

The tutor works with the tutee *by talk* for the work of their writings, not by text. This means that the tutor does not correct the errors in the text. They talk about it for the work of tutorial. Instruction for writing during the tutorial is conveyed through the medium of *talk* and talk in nature requires another interactant to perform. It cannot be a one-way, linear practice. It is a two-way *interaction* by its nature. This is why it is impossible to do the work of the tutorial when there is no engagement from the tutee (Kim, 2018c). If the tutee has no understanding about how to work with the tutor effectively for their writings, or if the tutee has no competence to engage freely due to a lack of oral/aural skills, the necessary condition for the work of tutorial becomes absent; the instruction falls into peril. When that happens, the burden to make the tutorial work falls on to the tutor. It is not just a dilemma that L2 tutees encounter; it is a conundrum for the tutor as well to figure out how to move on for the work of the tutorial. This is why dealing with the proofreading request is the first and the most critical task that the tutor has to achieve at the beginning of the tutorial in order to accomplish the successful engaging work of the tutorials (Kim, 2018a, 2018b).

6. Closing

The proofreading practice occurs as a routine instructional activity during tutorials in the writing center. Particularly, the proofreading practice that occurs as the main work of writing instruction requires collaboratively negotiated interactions between the tutor and the tutee for their work of writing during tutorials. When the work for problem pointing and problem solving is shared and contributed collaboratively by the tutor and the tutee, both the tutor and the tutee show their understanding clearly about the problems they work with. The instructional curriculum of the writing tutorial is up to what the tutee brings to the center for the work of tutorials. The tutee brings their own writing curriculum for the work of tutorials with their own writings. The curriculum for the writing tutorial is constituted by the turn-by-turn, talk in interactions that the tutor and the tutee share for the work of writing. The tutee's engagement in their interactions during tutorials provides the specific direction of what to do and what to teach for the next course of action and establishes the instant curriculum for instruction. Without the engagement from the tutee, instruction cannot begin. Therefore, the importance of the tutee's engagement cannot be emphasized enough for the work of the writing tutorials. Especially, if the tutee never has experienced face-to-face, conversation-based writing instruction in their previous learning experience, there should be some instruction for them to learn about the work of the writing tutorials, for example, by videoed tutorials, comments from the tutors and returning tutees' learning experiences, and some advice of how to work with the tutors to improve their writings, etc. This study will be beneficial for those who are interested in the work of the writing center and the interactional details of their talk and interactions during tutorials between the tutor and the tutee to deepen the understanding of the pedagogy of the writing instruction that the contemporary writing center pursues.

References

- Ashton-Jones, E. (1988). Asking the right questions: A heuristic for tutors. *Writing Center Journal*, 9 (1), 29-36.
- Brendel, C. (2012). Tutoring between Language with Comparative Multilingual Tutoring. *Writing Center Journal*, 32(1), 78-91.
- Brooks, J. (1991). Minimalist tutoring: Making the student do all the work. *Writing Lab Newsletter*, 15(6), 1-4.
- Carino, P. (2001). Early writing centers: Toward a history. *Writing Center Journal*, 15 (2), 103-15.
- Carino, P. (2003). Power and authority in peer tutoring. In Pemberton, M.A. & Kinkead, J. (Eds.), *The center will hold: Critical perspectives on writing center scholarship* (pp.96- 116). Utah State University Press.
- Chromik, M. (2002). Proofreading, its value and its place in the writing centre. *Opinion Papers*, 120, 3–15.
- Clark, I. (1988). Collaboration and ethics in writing center pedagogy. *Writing Center Journal*, 9(1), 3-12.
- Clark, I. (2001). Perspectives on the directive/non-directive continuum in the writing center. *Writing Center Journal*, 22 (1), 33-58.
- Connor, U. (1997). Contrastive rhetoric: Implications for teachers of writing in multicultural classrooms. In C. Severino, J. Guerra and J. Butler (Eds.), *Writing in multicultural settings* (pp.198-208). Modern Language Associations of America.
- Corbett, S. J. (2011). Tutoring style, Tutoring ethics: The continuing relevance of the directive/non-directive instructional debate. In Murphy, C. & Sherwood, S. (Eds.), *The St. Martin's sourcebook for writing tutors (4th ed.)* (pp. 148-155). Bedford/St. Martin's.
- Corbett, S.J. (2013). Negotiating pedagogical authority: The rhetoric of writing center tutoring styles and methods. *Rhetoric Review*, 32(1), 81–98.
- Dvorak, K. (2016). Multilingual writers, multilingual tutors: Code-switching/mixing/meshing in the writing center. In S. Bruce and B. Rafoth (eds.), *Tutoring second language writers* (pp.101-122). Utah State University Press.
- Ferris, D. (2003). *Response to student writing: Implications for second language students*. Routledge.
- Ferris, D. (2009). *Teaching college writing to diverse student populations*. University of Michigan Press.
- Geller, A., Eodice, M., Condon, F., Carroll, M., & Boquet, E. (2007). *Everyday writing center: A community of practice*. University Press of Colorado.
- Hairston, M. (1982). The winds of change: Thomas Kuhn and the revolution in the teaching of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 33, 76-88.
- Harwood, N. (2018). What do proofreaders of student writing do to a master's essay? Differing interventions, worrying findings. *Written Communication*, 35, 474-530.
- Harwood, N. (2019). "I have to hold myself back from getting into all that": Investigating ethical issues in the proofreading of student writing. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 17(1), 17-49. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-018-9322-5>
- Harwood, N., Austin, L., & Macaulay, R. (2009). Proofreading in a UK university: proofreaders' beliefs, practices, and experiences. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 18, 166–190.
- Harwood, N., Austin, L., & Macaulay, R. (2010). Ethics and integrity in proofreading: findings from an interview-based study. *English for Specific Purposes*, 29, 54–67.
- Harwood, N., Austin, L., & Macaulay, R. (2012). Cleaner, helper, teacher? The role of proofreaders of student writing. *Studies in Higher Education*, 37, 569–584.
- Hawkins, T. (1984). Introduction. In Olson, G.A. (Ed.), *Writing centers theory and administration* (pp.xi-xiv). NCTE.
- Hawthorne, J. (1999). 'We don't proofread here': Re-visioning the writing center to better meet student needs. *Writing Lab Newsletter*, 23(8), 1–7.
- He, A.W. (1994). Withholding academic advice: Institutional context and discourse practice. *Discourse Processes* 18, 297-316.
- Hinkel, E. (2004). *Teaching academic ESL writing: Practical techniques in vocabulary and grammar*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kim, J. (2014). *Better writers or better writing? A qualitative study of second language writers' experiences in a university writing center* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. The Ohio State University. http://rave.ohiolink.edu/etdc/view?acc_num=osu1398789858
- Kim, J. (2018a). Same bed, different dreams: The mismatched expectations about proofreading in the writing center. *International Research Studies in Language Learning*, 7(4), 89-103. <https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrsl.2018.3004>

- Kim, J. (2018b). Could you check my grammar? The forbidden request in the university writing center. *International Research Studies in Language Learning*, 7(4), 21-37. <https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrsl.2017.2000>
- Kim, J. (2018c). Revising orally: The transformative process from text to talk in the writing tutorial. *The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning*, 8(2), 109-122. <http://www.jltl.com.tr/index.php/jltl/article/view/69>
- Leki, I. (1993). Twenty-five years of contrastive rhetoric. Text analysis and writing pedagogies. In S. Silberstein (Ed.), *State of the art TESOL essays* (pp. 350-370). Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.
- Linville, C. (2009). Editing line by line. In S. Bruce & B. Rafoth (eds.), *ESL Writers A guide for writing center tutors* (2nd edition)(p.116-131), Boynton/Cook Publishers, Inc.
- Lunsford, A. (1991). Collaboration, control, and the idea of a writing center. *Writing Center Journal*, 12(1). 3-10.
- Markee, N. (1995). Teachers' answers to students' questions: Problematizing the Issue of making meaning. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 6 (2), 63-92.
- Markee, N. (2000). Conversation analysis. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Markee, N. (2004). Zones of interactional transition in ESL classes. *Modern Language Journal*, 88, 583-596.
- Markee, N. (2009). Toward a Learning Behavior Tracking Methodology for CA-for-SLA. *Applied Linguistics*, 29, 3, 404-427
- Maynard, D.W. (2003). *Bad news, good news: Conversational order in everyday talk and clinical settings*. University of Chicago Press.
- McNally, D. & Kooyman, B. (2017). Drawing the line: views from academic staff and skills advisors on acceptable proofreading with low proficiency writers. *Journal of Academic Language & Learning*, 11(1), A145–A158.
- Nakamaru, S. (2010). Theory in/to practice: A tale of two multilingual writers: A case study approach to tutor education. *Writing Center Journal*, 30, 100-123.
- Nan, F. (2012). Bridging the gap: Essential issues to address in recurring writing center appointments with Chinese ELL students. *Writing Center Journal*, 32, 50-63.
- Nordlof, J. (2014). Vygotsky, scaffolding and the role of theory in writing centre work. *Writing Center Journal*, 34(1), 45–63.
- North, S. (1984). The idea of a writing center. *College English*, 46 (5). 433-446.
- Park, I. (2017). "Questioning as advice resistance: Writing tutorial interactions with L2 writers." *Classroom Discourse*, 8(3), 253-270. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2017.1307125>
- Pomerantz, A. (2005). Using participants' video stimulated comments to complement analyses of interactional practices. In te Molder, H and Potter, J. (eds), *Conversation and Cognition* (pp.93-113). Cambridge University Press.
- Reid, J. (1998). "Eye" Learners and "Ear" learners: Identifying the language needs of international student and U.S. resident writers. In Byrd, P. & Reid, J.M.(Eds.), *Grammar in the Composition Classroom: Essays on Teaching ESL for College-Bound Students* (pp.3-17). Heinle.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50, 696-735.
- Shamoon, L.& Burns, D.H.(1995). A critique of pure tutoring. *Writing Center Journal*, 15(2), 134-51.
- Silverman, D. (1999). Warriors or collaborators: Reworking methodological controversies in the study of institutional interaction. In Sarangi, S. and Roberts, C. (eds.), *Talk, Work and Institutional Order: Discourse in Medical, Mediation and Management Settings* (pp. 401-425). Mouton de Gruyter.
- Thonus, T. (2002). Tutor and student assessments of academic writing tutorials: What is "success"? *Assessing Writing*, 8, 110-134.
- Thonus, T. (2004). What are the differences? Tutor Interactions with First-and Second- Language Writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13, 227-242.
- Walvoord, B. E. F. (1981). *Helping students write well: A guide for teachers in all disciplines*, Modern Language Association.
- Waring, H.Z. (2005). Peer tutoring in a graduate writing center: Identity, expertise, and advice resisting, *Applied Linguistics* 26, 141-168.
- Waring, H.Z., Creider, S., Tarpey, T., and Black, R. (2012). A search for specificity in understanding CA and context. *Discourse Studies*, 14(4), 477-492.
- Williams, J. (2004). Tutoring and revision: Second language writers in the writing center. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13(3), 173-201.

Appendix A

Transcript Notations

(.)	micro pause
(2.0)	Timed silence within or between adjacent utterances
//	Notes the point at which one speaker overlaps another.
=	Notes the ending of one utterance and the beginning of a next without gap or overlap.
—	Underlining indicates stress
(.h)	Indicates an in-breath
(h)	Indicates out breath
-	Hyphens indicate a word cut off in its production
* *	Notes soft speaking
:	A colon indicates a sound stretch on a word or word portion
()	Empty indicates an unheard utterance
(())	Double parentheses contain descriptions of the scene
[Left bracket indicates a simultaneous start by two speakers
]	Right bracket indicates two utterances ending simultaneously

ⁱ The empty parenthesis indicates the utterance that was not clearly hearable from the video.

ⁱⁱ He (1994), Waring (2005) and Park (2017) discussed this tutee's resistance for tutor's advice during tutorials as one of the tactical strategies that the tutee employs for their own agenda.

ⁱⁱⁱ Markee (1995, 2000, 2004) called this question a "counter question", which is specifically inserted by the teacher in order to regain the control of the immediate interaction with the learners for the classroom agenda.